

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

JOHN JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 05-CV-486-DRH

ORDER

HERNDON, District Judge:

On April 26, 2006, the Court issued an Order (Doc. 36) granting Plaintiff's Motion to Stay (Doc. 35). The reason for the stay was because the parties had apparently reached a settlement and expected to formalize and execute an agreement within twenty-one days. Therefore, Plaintiff requested the Court stay all matters, including Plaintiff's pending Response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 31). The Court granted the stay for a specific term. The Order stated that "[a]ll matters in this case will be stayed, but if the parties have not filed a stipulation for settlement as indicated in said Motion by May 26, 2006, or a motion requesting an extension of time, the stay will be lifted and the Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment will be due by May 31, 2006" (Doc. 36).

To date, the parties have neither filed a stipulation of settlement, an extension of time to file, nor has Plaintiff filed his Response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment. In other words, they have not complied with the Court's

April 26, 2006 Order. The stay is hereby **LIFTED**. Therefore, the parties shall either file a stipulation of settlement or Plaintiff shall file his Response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment or Plaintiff shall **SHOW CAUSE**, in writing, why this matter should not be dismissed for failure to respond to a dispositive motion¹ no later than **Tuesday, June 6, 2006**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 1st day of June, 2006.

/s/ David RHerndon
United States District Judge

¹ "Failure to timely file an answering brief to a motion may, in the court's discretion, be considered an admission of the merits of the motion." **Local Rule of Civil Procedure 7.1(c)**.